DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 264 812 HE 018 994

AUTHOR Carnahan, Robert E.
TITLE A Sociological Analysis of the Social System Referred to as Higher Education and the Social Organization of the Pennsylvania State University.
PUB DATE [85]
NOTE 50p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Historical Materials (060)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; College Role; Educational Development; *Educational History; Educational Objectives; Faculty Promotion; *Higher Education; *Organizational Theories; *Social Theories; Student Characteristics; *Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Recruitment
IDENTIFIERS *Pennsylvania State University

ABSTRACT

The history and development of the U.S. higher education system are analyzed, using Pennsylvania State University (Penn State) and its branch campuses as an example. Attention is also directed to the personality (i.e., characteristics and attitudes) of the individuals who function within the system/organization, methods of incorporating participants into the system (e.g., faculty recruitment and promotion), and an evaluation of the functionality of the U.S. system of higher education. Topics include: the effects of an aging faculty, trends in tenure, discrepancies in rank and tenure between male and female faculty, and student and faculty characteristics at Penn State. Specific concerns include: parents' educational and occupational background, parental income, student grades, student attitudes, and minority student enrollments. Structural-functionalism is discussed as a type of theoretical orientation to explain the higher education system. Four functional imperatives are discussed: adapting to the social and nonsocial environment, achieving the goal of formally socializing certain members of society, integrating the various subunits of the system, and maintaining the pattern within the system by which role-players can secure the goal. Some of the ways that higher education has adapted to societal needs is chronicled. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED264812

A Sociological Analysis of the Social System Referred to as Higher Education and the Social Organization of the Pennsylvania State University

Robert E. Carnahan

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert E. Carnahan

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

HE 011 P 994

A Sociological Analysis of the Social System Referred to as Higher Education and the Social Organization of the Pennsylvania State University

The purpose of this paper will be to analyze the system of higher education in the United States of America using the Pennsylvania State University as a focal organization.

The paper will be divided into four sections:

1. History and Development of the System of Higher Education in the United States of America in General and The Pennyslvania State University in Particular.
   A. The system to be studied is higher education in the United States.
   B. The social organization to be analyzed will be the Pennsylvania State University.
   C. A sub-organization to be analyzed will be the Branch Campuses of the Pennsylvania State University.
2. The Personality of the Individuals Who Function Within the System and the Organization.
3. Methods of Incorporating Participants into the System.
4. An Evaluation of the Functionality of the System of Higher Education in the United States.

Before we embark upon the main objectives of this paper it will be necessary to specify, by definition, the main concepts we will be dealing

with:

1. By education I mean the formal, rational, systematic training and/or teaching of the culture of a society.
2. By formal educational institution I mean that institution that has been specifically differentiated by a society to satisfy the need of passing on its culture to its next generation.
   A. As an institution it is a formalized set of roles arranged in a hierarchial relationship to each other which are reciprocal (the rights of one role become the obligations of another and vice versa).
   B. As an institution it has evolved out of the needs of society and has become embued with tradition, rituals and value.
3. By higher education I mean the system of formal education that extends beyond high school and serves the following purposes:

> Higher education is the method by which people are selected, screened, trained and placed in more desirable and more influential positions in society.
>
> Higher education provides a custodial function for young people whom the labor market is not yet ready to absorb... Higher education is a device used to help young people search and find their own personal identity and to understand the identities of others. Higher education is one of the devices by which research and intellectually related services are provided to society....higher education is intended to provide a leadership function.[1]

---

[1] Brown, Hugh S. and Mayhew, Lewis B. American Higher Education (New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc.) 1965, p. 11.

4. Social System - A structured pattern of role sets designed to obtain a more specific goal or need than an institution and being more autonomous than a social organization.
   A. The social system under study in this paper is higher education.
5. Social Organization - "....a rather general term that refers to any structured system of relationships among people."[2]
   A. As used in this paper it will refer to the specific organization of the Pennsylvania State University,
   B. Thus it has a specific denotation with a great deal of control over its role-players.

So much for the introcution. The next section will be a brief historical exposition of Higher Education in general and The Pennsylvania State University organization in particular.

History and Development of Higher Education in General and the Pennsylvania State University in Particular

In order to understand the phenomena of American Higher Education we need to be cognizant of the fact that the first universities established in the colonies were established using the English models of Oxford and Cambridge.

Higher education in America begins with Harvard in approximately 1836. The founders of this school came from a group of approximately one hundred Cambridge men and a third as many Oxford men who had migrated

---

[2] Lenski, Gerhard. Human Societies. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company), 1970. p. 38.

[3] Rudolph, Frederick, The American College and University: A History, (New York: Vintage Books), 1962, pp. 3-4.

to New England. "....they intended to create a bit of old England in America."[3]

According to Rudolph, "....the really important thing about Harvard College is that it was absolutely necessary, Puritan Massachusetts could not have done without it. Unable to set the world straight as Englishmen in England, the Puritan settlers of Massachusetts intended to set it straight as Englishmen in the New World."[4]

These Puritans were men who were imbued with a religious zeal to do God's work and part of God's work was to educate leaders for the future. And so it was that...."The two cardinal principles of English Puritanism which most profoundly affected the social development of New England and the United States were not religious tenets, but educational ideals: a learned clergy and a lettered people."[5] It is apparant then that the educational system reflected the needs of society. We needed to protect the souls of men and at the same time ensure a heritage of leaders. These men would spell the difference between civilization and barbarism according to the Puritans.

The pattern was set for all the colleges established before the Revolution - eight in number. The charters of each bore the distinct religious orientation of their founders - sort of an early religious status symbol. The College of William and Mary was founded in Virginia by the Anglicans. The Collegiate School in Connecticut (later Yale) was established by dissident Puritans who were chagrined over the liberal orientation of Harvard. The Congregationalists founded Dartmouth; the Baptists not to

---

[4] Ibid., p. 18.

[5] Morrison, Samuel Elliot, The Founding of Harvard College (Cambridge, 1935), p. 5.

be denied, founded the College of Rhode Island in Providence in 1765; the Presbyterians founded the College of New Jersey at Princeton (1746); the Dutch Reformed established Queens College (Rutgers) in 1766 and etc. Even though the denominational orientation was strong, the colleges very quickly became more broad in their social purposes. By the time of the Revolution, most were very flexible in their religious requirements. Religious tests were dropped as a requirement of admission in the 17th and 18th centuries.[6]

It is interesting to note further as Rudolph points out, these colleges "....were creatures as much of the state as of the established churches."[7] From their beginnings they had dual support which would last up until the Great Awakening.

"Colleges were in no sense popular institutions. They were shaped by aristocratic traditions and they served the aristocratic elements of colonial society."[8]

The European model, however, was not the same as its American colonial counterpart with regard to tenure and faculty control in governance.

The Medieval European scholars had fought battles to gain the rights of incorporation and state protection. Further, by balancing the ecclesiastical powers off against the secular powers of the state they were able to gain a degree of self governance that has not been equaled since. Of course, much individual freedom had to be sacrificed on the alter of collective control. If the Masters decided to strike you must be willing to go along. You could be removed as a member of the corporation by a

---

[6] Op. Cit. (Rudolph), pp. 8-18.

[7] Ibid., p. 13.

[8] Ibid., p. 18.

process termed priviation. Thus you were not fired but black-balled. This meant the loss of your academic privileges, suspension of immunity from secular and ecclesiastical authority, suspension of degrees; denied access to further degrees; and finally ostricism from the corporate body.[9]

This system of privilege was destroyed by the Protestant Reformation. The church and state were welded into a unit during the 16th and 17th centuries. The traditional split between Church and State could no longer be exploited by the Masters. "It was not until after the 17th century that the universities of central Europe began to lose their sectarian and despotic character."[10]

American colleges inherited this new trend. At Harvard, for example, the faculty had very little power. They were viewed basically as senior students who were there to help the president maintain discipline. The college was a simulated family with the president as the father, the tutors as his elder sons and both were engaged in raising the young men in their charge to maturity.[11]

A protracted battle would ensue until faculty began to get more self-governance and control over academic policy.

Another impact of significance in the evolving system of higher education was the American Revolution.

> "The legacy of the American Revolution to the American college was, then a heady mixture of French deism, unruly students, state controls and a widely held belief that colleges were now serving a

---

[9] Keast, William R. and Macy, John W., Jr. Faculty Tenure. "Academic Tenure in America: A Historical Essay", Walter P. Metzger. (Jossey-Bass Publishers), 1973, pp. 93-160.

[10] Ibid., p. 106.

[11] Ibid., pp. 93-160.

> a new responsibility to a new nation: the preparation of young men for responsible citizenship in a Republic must prove itself, the preparation for lives of usefulness of young men who also intended to prove themselves."[12]

These are not the type of young people who stand for flogging or kneel at his tutor's feet to get his ears boxed. They had been Americanized.[13]

After the Revolution the United States went on a binge of college founding that is just now beginning to abate. Wherever people went so also went the desire for an educational institution. An analogy today, on the level of the family, is a pool in every backyard.

And what of the position of the faculty in the 19th century. President Elliot in his inaugural address at Harvard in 1869 summed the situation up very succinctly as follows:

> The poverty of scholars is of inestimable worth in this money-getting nation. It maintains the true standards of virtue and honor. The poor friars, not the bishops, saved the Church. The poor scholars and preachers of duty defend the modern community against its own material prosperity. Luxury and learning are ill bed-fellows.[14]

This was the pattern of exploitation necessary if the colleges were going to stay in business. "The choice was a simple one: the colleges could either pay their professors to teach or they could pay their students to enroll".[15] As Francis Wayland, the president of Brown put it "....We

---

[12] Op. Cit. Rudolph, p. 40.

[13] Op. Cit. Rudolph, p. 27.

[14] Elliot, Charles William, Address at Inauguration at Harvard's President (Cambridge, 1869), p. 48.

[15] Op. Cit. (Rudolph), p. 197.

cannot induce men to pursue a collegiate course unless we offer it vastly below its cost, if we do not give it away altogether...."[16] There were too many colleges and very little need in society for an educated mass of people who could speak Latin and Greek.

The "Jacksonian Democracy" heralded a new age for American society in general and American colleges in particular. Glimmerings of trends to come were already on the horizon - increasing democratization of American life; the importance of science as a source of answers to the more abundant life; the industrial revolution which would dawn during the Civil War and the need for technically trained personnel. All of these trends would radically alter the Middle Ages curriculum of the Trivium (rhetoric, dialectic and grammar) and the Quadrivium (arithmetic, geometry, astronomy and music) blended with Latin, Greek and Hebrew.

Out of these democratic changes came the public high school. By the 1870s it was prevalent throughout the northeastern and central states. "It was open without entrance examination to graduates of common school; it charged no tuition fees; and it offered classical studies to students preparing for college and what would now be referred to as vocational programs for students preparing for the common vocations of the time."[17] For most Americans this was the credentialling ticket for practically any job. It had more weight before World War II than college degrees have today.

It was at this critical juncture in American cultural history that

---

[16] Wayland, Francis, Thoughts on the Present Collegiate System in the United States (Boston, 1842) pp. 15-17.

[17] Deighton, Lee C. (ed.), The Encyclopedia of Education, Vol. 4, (The Macmillan Company and Free Press), 1971., p. 381.

Land-grant colleges were legislated into existence. The Morrill Act of 1862 was the federal government's first direct attempt (on the part of the federal government) to legislate educational opportunity.

Most of the new colleges that emerged were in the new spirit of changing their offerings to meet the new needs of our society.

Penn State, for example, had its not so auspicious debut as The Farmers' High School of Pennsylvania in 1852. The charter of this organization stated that its function was "....an institution for the education of youth in various branches of science, learning and practical agriculture, as they are connected with each other by name, style and title of the Farmers' High School of Pennsylvania."[18] The Farmers' High School, from its beginning then, is marked by a very pragmatic orientation that is a key feature of the American Ethos. Education was to become a practical tool for the average American. Only through utility could it be viewed as having value.

The next great change for the institution which was to become Penn State was the Morrill Act of 1862. The name of the institution was changed to the Agricultural College of Pennsylvania in anticipation of becoming the "Land-Grant College" for Pennsylvania.

The institution, as established, incorporated the various popular sentiments of the time in its curriculum - science, agriculture, pragmatism, educating the citizenry for democracy; a representative student body from the entire state and an emphasis on hard work.[19]

---

[18] The Pennsylvania State Source Book, Appendix A, "An Act to Incorporate The Farmers' High School of Pennsylvania" (The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA), July 1, 1973, pp. VIII-1.

[19] Ibid., pp. IB-1 and IB-2.

Problems were abundant and apparent with the new status of the school. W. F. Dunaway summarizes the problems that occurred between 1865 and 1882 in the following manner:

1. The school was too new to have earned the confidence of the people.
2. The battle with the classical colleges was continuing unabated.
3. The college had difficulty in persuading the legislature to support it (sounds familiar).
4. Its students could not afford a high tuition and fees, thus compounding its fiscal problems with the State Legislature.
5. There seemed to be confusion over the academic objectives of the school on the part of the authorities.[20]

It can easily be ascertained from the above summation that Penn State had to constantly adjust to the demands of society even from its very beginning. In fact, it arose out of public demand. Of course, we could make the same statement about all of society's institutions. They either function to meet the needs of society, change aa society changes; or cease to exist as a viable institution.

Another historical development concerning the Pennsylvania State University has been the creation of the Commonwealth campus system as an attempt to be accountable to society.

Once again it became necessary to adjust to the changing demands of Pennsylvanians and the branch campus system was the result.

Although Penn State's first extension branch school opened

---

20 Dunaway, W. F., History of the Pennsylvania State College (Lancaster Press, Inc., Lancaster, Pa.), p. 95.

> in Allentown in 1912 the present statewide system of Commonwealth campuses had its origin in the great economic depression of the thirties. At the request of local people, experimental "Freshmen Extension Centers" were opened in September of 1933 in Bradford, Warren, Sayre, Towanda.... It came to the student only because the student could not come to the University. It did not guarantee to operate the centers for more than one year at a time, as they were regarded only as temporary units.[21]

Penn State has had as many as thirty-six of these centers of which twenty-two exist today as basically "feeder" campuses to the Main Campus. The exceptions to this are Hershey Medical School, Behrend, Capitol campuses and University Park; the latter three are four year campuses.

Problems of structure, organization, function, mission, status, curriculum, management autonomy and communication seem to be almost generic to any new organization but particularly to twenty-some odd campuses. Once the can-of-worms was opened in 1912 the system and the needs (community needs) became almost self-generating. The local community's rationale seemed to be, if this area or town has a campus why shouldn't we, if we can prove a need.

Personality Characteristics of the Individuals Who Function Within the System

It should not be surprising that the situation today is reflective of the situation in the past in relation to the social characteristics and genetic characteristics of the persons who people the various roles within the system.

---

[21] Op. Cit., p. III F-1.

From its very beginning Higher Education was predominantly male, white, protestant and had pupils from various socio-economic backgrounds. Using Harvard as an example again, between 1677-1703 there were 330 graduates of Harvard. Of 224 that could be accounted for 28 (15%) were the sons of wealthy farmers or military leaders; 79 (35%) were sons of ministers; 45 (20%) were the sons of merchants, shopkeepers or master mariners; 34 (15%) were the sons of magistrates and lawyers; 31 (15%) were the sons of artisans, seamen and servants and 11 (5%) had parents that were ordinary farmers. The age of some of those who attended Harvard was as low as 12 - dependent upon when they had graduated from the academy.

Teachers who were recruited from the ranks of pupils were reflective of the same characteristics - white, protestant, males who had been prepared for the ministry. Most took jobs as college faculty only on a temporary basis until they were assigned a church of their own. The rewards for ministers, though miniscule, were much higher than for tutors.[22]

In the 1720s a new rank was added to the traditional stratification system of trustees, president and tutors. This was the rank of professor. The professor stood in sharp contrast to the tutor in terms of role expectations and prestige - "mature where the other was often callow, prominent or at least promising in a discipline where the other ran the gamut of subjects with obscure effect; allowed to marry and live off campus, where the other still abided by the clerical rule of celibacy and the life immured."[23] Further, most of the professors were not appointed to limited terms.

What was happening is obvious, there is a differential recruitment,

---

[22] Seckinger, Professor Robert, Notes from History of Higher Education (221), Feb. 13, 1974.

[23] Morrison, Samuel E., Three Centuries of Harvard (Cambridge, 1936), pp.66-69.

treatment and set of expectations for faculty based on expertise in a discipline. The disciplines were maturing in the new world and as they did standards of recruitment became more stringent. This is also the beginning of the "up or out" rule that was made possible by the creation of a structure of ranks.

The difference in numbers of persons partaking in higher education is quite different today than in the past. In 1870 American institutions of higher learning enrolled somewhat over 50,000 young persons. This would mean that about 1.7% of the young people aged 18-21 would be in college.[24] In 1960 there were approximately 3,500,000 young persons attending institutions of higher learning; in 1970 there were 7,000,000. In 1876 there were 311 colleges and universities; in 1960 there were 2,026. This tremendous proliferation indicates the need for more highly educated persons caused by the industrial revolution and the faith of the American people in education.

It should be interesting to compare the characteristics of the faculty today with the material we have just reviewed. Following is a summary of the two studies conducted by the American Council of Education (ACE) in conjunction with the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The first, surveyed faculty in higher education during the 1968-1969 academic year and the second surveyed faculty during the 1972-1973 academic year.

A comparison of the two studies by Alan E. Bayer indicates that the faculty is getting older. "In 1968-69 the median faculty age was 40; in

---

[24] Thwing, Charles F., American Colleges: Their Students and Work (New York, 1878), p. 144; U. S. Office of Education: Educational Directory 1960-1961, Part 3, Higher Education (Washington 1960).

1972-73 it was over 43."[25] This is probably due to the tightening of the job market which will be discussed in the next section.

The possibility of much recruitment into the ranks of higher education seems remote because ".... proportionately few faculty are near retirement age; less than 8% are over 60."[26]

Aging faculty are also more likely to dominate the senior academic ranks, particularly since tenure is often equated with number of years on the faculty. "In 1972-73, fully half of all faculty held either the rank of associate or full professor compared to 42% in 1968-69."[27] Further, the study indicated that substantially more men than women held positions in the senior level ranks despite the fact that women faculty were older than their male counterpart. Age as a selective factor in rank, seems to count most heavily for men.

Another interesting note is the rise in the proportion of tenured. "In 1968-69, fewer than half (47%) were tenured, whereas almost two-thirds (65%) were tenured in 1972-73."[28] Women again were less likely to have tenure.

Part of the inflation in rank and tenure must also be attributed to the advent of massive numbers of community colleges. Disproportionately high levels of tenure and rank at these institutions have inflated the overall average.

In the categories of Black faculty members and females, "In 1968-69,

---

[25] Bayer, Alan E. "College Faculties: 'Le Plus Ca Change'", Change Vol. 6, No. 4, March 1974.

[26] Ibid.

[27] Ibid.

[28] Ibid.

2.2% of all college and university faculty were blacks and 19.1% were women. In 1972-73, there were 2.9% blacks and 20% women."[29] It seems that Affirmative Action programs have made some real though slight headway in a relatively short period of time.

Another interesting finding of the two studies is that while the job market for faculty in higher education has been getting tighter there has not been an appreciable increase in the number of doctorates that one might be led to expect.

> Among faculty respondents who reported their highest degree in 1968-69, 53% at universities, 39% at four year colleges, and 5% at junior colleges, reported either a Ph.D. or Ed.D. Comparable figures for 72-73 are 48% at universities, 38% at four year institutions and 6% at junior colleges.[30]

One can only speculate on the reasons that organizations in higher education are not hastening to hire the numerous Ph.D.s being churned out by graduate schools. Perhaps it can partly be attributed to finances.

Women hold more sub-doctoral degrees than men. "Nationally, in 1972-73, 69% of the female faculty and 47% or the male faculty held a master's degree or less."[31] This partly explains the discrepancy in rank and tenure between male and female since a doctorate is one of the screening mechanisms in both.

Teaching leads also seem to be increasing at all the levels of higher education despite the fact that all of these levels (two year colleges, four year colleges and universities) have an increasing proportion of faculty

---

[29] Ibid., p. 50.

[30] Ibid.

[31] Ibid.

members in the senior ranks (who are believed to have lighter teaching loads than their junior colleagues).

> The average number of classroom teaching hours rose between 1968-69 and 1972-73 at all types of institutions. In two year institutions, 80% of the faculty spent nine or more hours in the classroom in 1968-69; 84% did in 1972-73. Similar figures at four year colleges were 64% in 1968-69 and 67% in 1972-73; in universities the proportion rose from 35% to 42%.[32]

Two major trends were interrelated and were likely responsible for these increases: financial exigencies and prodding by state legislatures to produce more credit hours.

The faculty at Penn State reflect this trend. Professors, for example, average 10.1 credits per term as compared to 8.7 credits per term for the average of all Penn State University faculty. Thus full professors are teaching more credit hours than associate, assistant and instructor ranks.[33] Further, the average student/faculty ratio has climbed from 13.9-1 in 1954 to 20.9-1 in 1970.[34]

"In 1968-69, only one in five faculty identified himself as having no religious affiliation; in 1972-73, three in five indicated that they considered themselves religious."[35]

Politically there were some interesting changes also. "In 1968-69,

---

[32] Ibid.

[33] Report of Enrollment, Student Credit Hours, Course Credits and Faculty Activity Academic Year 1972-73. Office of the President, The Pennsylvania State University, March 30, 1973.

[34] The Penn State Source Book, The Pennsylvania State University, July 1, 1974.

[35] Op. Cit. (Bayer), p. 63.

only 5% described their current politics as leftist, 40% as liberal, 27% as middle-of-the-road and 28% as conservative. In 1972-73, 44% considered themselves politically conservative."[36] It would seem that part of this shift might be due to concern over the student reaction to involvement in Viet Nam that was current in the late 60s and early 70s. The consequent reaction of students may have led many faculty to reassess their ideological positions.

Both surveys indicated that most faculty (9 out of 10) enjoyed and encouraged relations with students in and out of the classroom. Further, most teachers seemed to enjoy teaching. In fact when asked their relative preferences for teaching or research, more than three-fourths of the faculty indicated a preference for teaching. Men, however, were less likely to prefer teaching than were women faculty. Even when asked to describe their singular most rewarding professional experience most faculty described a teaching experience.[37]

Faculty are not opposed to students taking part in governance in higher education. "In 1968-69, 59% agreed that faculty promotions should be based in part on formal student evaluations of their teachers; 69% endorsed the same statement in 1972-73."[38]

In both surveys, four-fifths concurred that teaching effectiveness, not publications, should be the primary basis for faculty promotions."[39]

Nor was there evidence of a massive trend toward alienation since the

---

[36] Ibid.

[37] Ibid.

[38] Ibid.

[39] Ibid.

vast majority of faculty indicated satisfaction with their careers and choice of careers.[40]

It should be apparent then that there have been vast changes in the types of faculty personnel, the attitudes of the personnel and institutional policy in relation to its faculty in the social system of higher education from its denominational beginnings to today.

Under this section we have one last area to cover and that is the characteristics of faculty and students in the social organization of the Pennsylvania State University (here after referred to by its more common name - Penn State).

From 1958 to 1973, resident enrollment at Penn State tripled - from 18,000 to 55,000.

In terms of religion, about 25% of Penn State's students are Roman Catholic and a little over half are Protestant. About 4% profess to be Jews and another 11% say they have no religious affiliation.

Over 50% of the University Park students' fathers were engaged in professional or business occupations compared to commonwealth campus students who were in the baccalaureate program and 36% of the students on commonwealth campuses who were in the two year associate degree programs. A higher percentage of the commonwealth campus students who were in the two year associate degree programs indicated their fathers were employed as skilled, semi-skilled or unskilled workers.

Nearly two-thirds of the University Park students reported their fathers had completed some education beyond high school. In contrast, 43% of the fathers of commonwealth campus students who were in the baccalaureate program and 35% of the students who were in the associate degree program

---

[40] Ibid.

at the commonwealth campuses stated that their fathers had completed some high school.

There is a notable difference between the total parental income reported by University as compared to commonwealth campus B.A.s and commonwealth campus associate degree students. Among University Park students about 16% reported that their family income was $10,000 or less while this figure for the commonwealth campus baccalaureate and commonwealth campus associate degree students is about 19% and 34% respectively.

There is a fairly large difference between the average high school grades of University Park students compared with commonwealth campus baccalaureate and associate degree students. While the University Park students have a higher percentage of "A" students than the national norms, both commonwealth campus baccalaureate and associate degree groups have fewer "A" students than reported in the national norm. For all institutional categories, females tend to have higher grades than males.

When selected opinions on certain issues were requested the following occurred: a majority of 75% felt the government was not doing an effective job in protecting the consumer; about half felt that marijuana should be legalized; about 40% felt there was little they could do to change society; approximately 50% said that the most important benefit from college was monetary; only one-third felt that grades should be abolished; of all students interviewed only one-third were in favor of giving disadvantaged preferred treatment and 22% were in favor of open admissions for public institutions of higher education.[41]

It seems also, that the number of minority students (Black, Indian, Oriental and Spanish surnamed) increased in total number but decreased in

---

[41] Op. Cit. (Penn State Source Book) pp. VC-1-5, See appendix for charts.

percentage for Pennsylvania institutions of higher education. Between 1970-72, the number of minority students grew from 14,672 to 15,733 but the percentage of minority students of the total student body fell from 5.8% to 5.6%. Penn State ranks below this average at the main campus where 4.1% are minorities and at most of its branch campuses.[42] This, despite the fact that Penn State has been recruiting Blacks with an Educational Opportunity Program. The program, although designed for helping lower class students, in effect is used as a recruiting mechanism for Blacks.

The patterns are clearly discernable in terms of socio-economic position and high school grades at the University Park campus.

The opinions of Penn State students seem to be consistent with what Yankelovich and Clark uncovered in their attitudional study of college and non-college youth between the ages of 16 and 25. They compared the results between four previous youth studies (1967, 1969, 1970, 1971) with their findings from the 1973 study. Their conclusions are interesting. Among other things they report that alienation has decreased amongst the college students and increased amongst the non-college blue-collar young person.

The alienation associated with campus disruptions of the late 60s and the Viet Nam War have seemed to dissipate. Students (college) have shifted their concern away from remedying social problems and more toward private self-fulfillment or growth.

---

[42] Office of Civil Rights of the Department of Health. "Undergraduate Enrollment of Minorities in U. S. Higher Education", The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. IX, Number 8, November 11, 1974, pp. 8-12.

According to the study there is an increasing attempt among college students to find interesting work and to integrate one's private life with meaningful work experiences. The dichotomy between work and private life is seen as undesirable - unlike studies of students in the 50s. This is the very point of the new alienation of the blue-collar young. They realize that without more education the socially valued positions are not open to them - thus the crux of their alienation.[43] What these changes will mean for the college and university community is not certain but it makes for some interesting conjecture. It will probably mean more student concern over studying, grades and degrees. What the impact of the constricting job market will have on this renewed enthusiasm will remain to be seen. Suffice it to say, however, that we sociologists and educators are in for an interesting and challenging time in relation to student needs and interests.

At this juncture a brief sketch of the graduate student is in order. "In 1973 graduate students comprised about 13% of Penn State's total student population. It is expected that this proportion will increase."[44]

"In recent years, limited resources have made it difficult for the Graduate School to admit even half the qualified applicants and this gap is widening."[45] The result, of course, is more competition to fill the vacancies. The Graduate School has no fixed maximum or minimum grade point average for admission but a general rule of thumb is 2.5 on a 4 point scale. Of course when the vacancies are scarce, competition is maximized and the

---

[43] Yankelovich, Daniel and Clark, Ruth, "College and Noncollege Youth Values", Change Vol. 6, Number 7, Sept. 1974, pp. 45-46.

[44] Op. Cit. (Penn State Source Book).

[45] Ibid.

result is that most graduate slots call for a 3.00 Q.P.A. or better.

"About two out of every three graduate students receive some kind of financial assistance. A little less than half the students are graduate assistants."[46]

Penn State does not meet the average for Pennsylvania in minorities (Spanish surnamed, Black, Oriental and Indian) enrolled in the Graduate School. The average for all organizations engaged in higher education in Pennsylvania fell from 6.6% in 1970 to 6.0% in 1972. At the same time Penn State had only 4.8% enrolled in its graduate school.[47]

From a description of the graduate students to a description of the faculty seems appropriate at this time.

Out of a total of 5,490 full time and part time faculty in the fall of 1973, Penn State has 523 full professors, the largest numbers coming in the disciplines of agriculture (115) and liberal arts (101). Associate professors total 668 and again the largest numbers are in agriculture (111) and liberal arts (110). There are 1,083 assistant professors and 759 instructors within the Penn State system.

As was already mentioned the student faculty ratio has increased from 13.9-1 in 1954 to 20.9-1 in 1970.

In terms of salary trends between 1954 and 1973: The mean salaries for professors increased from $17,730 to $21,419; for associate professors, $6,306 to $15,591; for assistant professors, $5,201 to $12,745; and for

---

[46] Ibid.

[47] The Office of Civil Rights of the Department of Health Education and Welfare "1972 Enrollment of Minorities in U. S. Graduate Schools", The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. IX, Number 11, Dec. 2, 1974, pp. 8-9.

instructors $4,364 to $10,491.[48] Despite these increases, the AAUP annually ranks Penn State amongst the lowest paying public universities.

The average hours per week worked by faculty members was estimated at 50.6 for the fall term of 1972.[49]

The total number of faculty engaged in higher education as of 1970 was 825,000, of which 643,000 were males and 182,000 were females.[50]

The Methods of Incorporation Into The System and the Organization

The third section will deal with how potential faculty are recruited from the ranks of undergraduates, methods by which promotion and rewards are handed out.

College and university teachers usually have to go through a long and arduous task of collecting degrees. Most social organizations of higher education demand at least a Master's degree from an accredited school as a minimum for consideration for a position. The general ideal is for the person to be well on his way to a Ph.D.

Before this lofty position is attained the individual is subject to a series of competitive evaluative criterion to see if he is "worthy" of such a prestigious position. Many students either drop-out or don't aspire to further education.

Let us begin at the beginning of the process of selection and allocation in higher education.

Students, of course, vary on such important selective items as intellectual ability "...it is not uncommon, in typical freshman classes, for

---

[48] Ibid., p. VA-24.

[49] Op. Cit. (Report of Enrollment....1972-73), p. 38.

[50] U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, "A Century of Growth of U. S. Colleges", The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. VIII, No. 40, Aug. 19, 1974, p. 9.

I.Q.s to range from 105 to 150[51] - "differences in experiences; differences in reaction to learning experiences; differences in reasons for enrolling (to get a job, etc.) and differences in motivation."[52]

Social class has to be considered as another differentiating variable that effects selection into higher education. It should be obvious that certain colleges and universities are geared to specific stratas. Harvard, Yale and etc. recruit the upper-classes and the upper-middle; state universities are usually for the middle and lower-middle classes and the community colleges are for the lower and lower-middle classes.

Most colleges and universities have formulas concerning admission standards which involve some combination of class standing in high school and S.A.T. (Scholastic Aptitude Test) scores. The object is to select the highest candidates on this scale until the available student slots are filled.

Community colleges are open to all residents of an area, over 18 who might benefit from the experience.

The community colleges are based on the idea of direct responsiveness to community needs. As such, there are five basic programs offered: 2-year baccalaureate (transfer); general education; vocational education; adult education (usually non-credit) and community interest courses (non-credit). Thus the community colleges are consistent with the philosophy which the Land Grant colleges outgrew. The basic idea here is that education should be available to all people regardless of educational background, race, ethnicity, social class and etc. Further, it should be available at

---

[51] Brown, James W. and Thornton, James W., Jr. College Teaching - A Systematic Approach, (New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1963) p. 67.

[52] Ibid., pp. 67-72.

a low cost. Lastly, the social organization should be malable in relation to public needs.[53]

The community college student is more representative of the college age student population in the United States than his counterpart in four year colleges and universities. The students manifest the following characteristics: Almost equally divided between above and below average; predominately from families with moderate to low incomes; similar to the overall population in racial composition; the average student is older (25) and he or she is attending school to further their professional or vocational objectives.[54]

Another very important function of higher education is to keep the high school graduate out of the glutted labor market. As John Keats so succinctly puts it, a young person goes to college "....essentially because there is no longer any socially acceptable place except college in our society for bright boys between 18 and 21 years of age, and because the brightest of the bright are encouraged, enticed, persuaded, badgered, hounded, ordered, and driven to try to get to places like Yale."[55]

Various "rites of passage" must be overcome by these students. Their main concern however, will be to maintain a "C" average or 2.00 Quality Point Average to remain in the school of their choice.

The more motivated and perhaps brighter students will probably begin

---

[53] Kerr, Clark T. (et. al.) Carnegie Commission Report on the Open Door Colleges: Policies for Community Colleges, (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishing Co., 1974) pp. 68-72.

[54] Evans, Jerome "Free Access: What It Takes", Change, Vol. 6, No. 2, March 1974, pp. 53-55.

[55] Keats, John, The Sheepskin Psychosis, (New York: Dell Publishing Co., Inc., 1963), p. 34.

to fit into what Martin called the Academic Sub-culture. Faculty prefer these types of students. In short, they enjoy teaching students who are like themselves, and encourage them to be even more like themselves.[56] What ensues then is an anticipatory socialization, in which the student is expected to aspire toward graduate school.

There of course is a "pecking order of the elite" as Marguiles and Blau point out. Each discipline has its more prestigious schools (in law, for example, it would be Harvard and Yale; in education it would be Standford and Columbia; in engineering, it would be MIT and Standford and etc.). These elite schools in each discipline will be reserved for the elite.[57]

Entrance is usually based on such criteria as Quality Point Average, prestige of your under-graduate degree; recommendations of mentors and written reasons why you desire entrance. As the prestige of the graduate school declines the requirements for admission decline.

Upon admission, most graduate schools place other hurdles in one's path - credits to be earned, language requirements, theses and etc. Many graduate schools are modifying these requirements (ie. . . some have dropped language requirements and etc.).

One of the main reasons for this reduction in standards was because of the need for faculty during the 1960's.

---

[56] Martin, W. B., Conformity: Standards & Change in Higher Education (San Francisco: Josey-Bass, 1969).

[57] Marguiles, R.Z. & Blau, P. M., The Pecking Order of the Elite: America's Leading Professional Schools", Change, Vol. 5, No. 9, Nov. 1973, pp. 21-27.

A problem related to the admission to graduate schools has been the recent "inflation of grades" at most campuses. The evidence would indicate that this practice of grade inflation will increase as competition amongst organizations of higher education for scarce students increases during the 1970's and 80's.

It seems apparent then, that these students form an ideal type of sorts and these favored students seem to have a distinctive personality configuration:

> The teachers nominate people who have a good credit ratio, who are high on admission criteria, but not necessarily the top candidates, who have high social maturity, who show a moderate amount of impulse expression, who are low on measures of suppression and repression, who achieve high developmental status as seniors, who are low on conformity and integration into the student peer-culture, who have adequate self-confidence, who are mildly dominating, who tend toward masculine interests and who are low on authoritarian tendencies both personally and with respect to socio-political issues.[58]

And these, except for the authoritarian tendencies, are a fairly good composite of a professor's personality.

---

58 Bro ., D. "Personality, College Environments and Productivity" in The American College (ed. N. Sandford), (New York: Wiley, 1962), p. 544.

These are the persons considered worthy of acceptance to work on advanced degrees. Many drop out before they pass all the hurdles. Lets assume that the person has a Ph.D. and proceed on to the next consideration.

The Doctorate of Philosophy is considered to be the highest degree that can be earned in this country. "It is thought to be a passport for college teaching since its requirements generally include demonstrated mastery of a discipline, expertise in a segment of the discipline, a broad general background of education, and the ability to research and write constructively, if not creatively on a project."[59]

Most schools in higher education have not been able to recruit enough Ph.D.'s to fill their positions. This was mainly the result of the rapid growth in numbers of students who enrolled in colleges and universities during the 1950's. There were simply not enough Ph.D.'s to fill all the slots.

Today, the reverse is true. ". . . good teaching positions have been more difficult to find . . . Since 1970 colleges have been able to be a bit more selective in their hiring policies, and non-academic employers are likely to find it easier to lure new Ph.D.'s."[60]

A recurrent theme in all of the journals and magazines associated with higher education point to the glut of Ph.D.'s and the concern over

---

59 Bornheimer, Deane G.; Burns, Gerald & Dumke, Glenn, S., The Faculty in Higher Education (Illinois: The Interstate Printers & Publishers, Inc.), 1973, p. 39.

60 Cartter, Alan M., "Future Faculty: Needs & Resources" In Improving College Teaching, Calvin B.T. Lee (ed.), (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education), 1967, p. 113.

whether these new candidates can be absored by the system. The growth in Ph.D.'s granted has been phenomenal - "30,000 Ph.D.'s per year in 1969 as contrasted with 10,000 per year in 1960".[61]

The colleges and universities, for their part, ". . . seek faculty who are good teachers, good scholars, and good people. However, since all three are seldom available in the same candidate, some compromise is necessary. Typically, the small colleges compromise its emphasis on research while the large university sacrifices either teaching or the personal qualities of the individual."[62]

Penn State finds itself in a paradoxical situation in this controversy. At the main campus the emphasis has been on recruiting and rewarding research oriented faculty while at the campuses the emphasis has been on recruiting (but not rewarding as well) faculty oriented more toward teaching.

"The past decades have given rise to much rhetoric and vociferous debate over the contributions of an individual's research or scholarly pursuits to his or her teaching effectiveness. The available research evidence suggests there is probably little relationship between the two."63

---

[61]Kidd, Chas. V., "Graduate Education: The New Debate", Change, Vol 6, No. 4, May 1974, p. 50.

[62]Wilson, R. C. & Gaff, J. G., The Teaching Environment (Berkeley: The Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of Calif., 1971), pp. 15-16.

[63]Ibid., p. 4.

Hammond, Meyer and miller, for example, found that ". . . knowledge of a professor's teaching quality and of the quality of his research does not help in knowing the other."[64] In further corroboration of this point, W. Thielins, Jr. stated ". . . To the extent that ratings of teacher's instruction are a fair criterion, students seldom suffer appreciably if their instructor is a researcher and writer, and in some cases have shown signs of real benefit."[65]

"Critics of the reward structure of higher education repeatedly have pointed to the paradox that while faculty are hired to teach, they are rewarded not for their teaching abilities or efforts, but for their research or scholarly prowess."[66]

In a massive survey of faculty in the spring of 1969 conducted by Martin Trow and Seymour M. Lipset, 54% of the faculty said their interests were in both teaching and research, 42% said they were heavily involved in teaching and only 4% said that they were interested in research to the virtual exclusion of teaching.[67]

---

[64]Hammond, P. C.; Meyer, J.W. and Miller, D., "Teaching Versus Research: Sources of Misperceptions", Journal of Higher Education, XL (Dec. 1969), pp. 682-690.

[65]Thielins, W. Jr., "The Undergraduate's View of Professors Research: Findings from the Empirical Literature" (unpublished paper, Bureau of Applied Research, Columbia University, Jan. 1971), p. 1.

[66]Op. Cit. (Gaff & Wilson), p. 3.

[67]Bayer, A. E., College & University Faculty: A Statistical Description (Washington: American Council on Education, 1970).

> The teaching-research problem is especially serious because there are two reward structures tugging and pulling at the faculty member. One's national advancement rests on publishing in a specialty, being active in a professional society and being visible and respected by specialists at other schools. One's advancement locally, although related to one's professional activity may operate quite independently of the national system. It depends on one's contribution to the school by teaching, counseling, administration, and, if the school values national prominence, one's national professional standing. It can well be argued that to the extent that faculty in recent years have become more concerned with their national prominence and less interested in local teaching activities, it is because these two advancement procedures have gotten out of balance.[68]

There is a widespread dissatisfaction among faculty members with the present criterion upon which salary and promotion decisions are made. A survey by Gaff and Wilson found that teaching was a major source of satisfaction in the lives of 88% of the faculty and that 92% felt that effectiveness as a teahcer should either be quite or very important in

---

[68] Op. Cit. (Gaff & Wilson), p. 4.

salary and promotion decisions. However, only 39% felt that teaching effectiveness actually was quite or very important at their own institutions. This discrepancy was found in every one of the six diverse schools surveyed by Gass and Wilson.[69]

The reward structure of most colleges and universities include promotion, salary increases and tenure. These rewards are extrinsic in nature.

As has been pointed out, these rewards are typically given out for activity (research and publications) other than teaching.

Other rewards are more intrinsic in nature. These include such things as: helping a student grow in knowledge and maturity, feelings of one's own professional and personal growth, recognition from students and colleagues for a job well done, commitment to shared goals and high purpose and etc. The rewards here are just as powerful a set of motivators as the extrinsic rewards.

It would seem to follow logically from the above that there should be more emphasis on teaching as a criterion for promotion, tenure and salary increases. As H. A. Wallin points out, the reward structure does make a difference in what faculty members do. He found that faculty members in colleges which gave merit increases for teaching effectiveness actually engaged in more teaching-related activities such as counseling students,

---

[69]Gaff, J. G. & Wilson, R.C. "The Relationship Between Professor's Views of the Formal Incentive System and their Career Status". (Paper presented at the meeting of Western Psychological Assoc., Vancouver, British Columbia, June 10, 1969.)

reading in their subjects and attending conferences and seminars in their fields. It appeared that these differential activity patterns were the result of the recognition and rewarding of teaching.[70]

The actual decisions concerning tenure, promotion and salary are made at different levels of the social organization.

Tenure is basically a commitment on the part of the university to continue faculty appointments until retirement for age or physical disability, subject to dismissal for adequate cause or unavoidable termination on account of financial exigency or change of institutional program.

Adequate cause for dismissal includes demonstrated incompetency or dishonesty in teaching or research, manifest neglect of duties and to personal conduct that interferes with the fulfillment of the individual's duties.

Tenure usually includes the rights of academic freedom and due process when relieved of a position. Most of these provisions were spelled out in 1940 in the AAUP's statement on tenure and academic freedom.[71]

The tenure process at Penn State includes peer evaluation, administrative evaluation and student evaluation. Once the individual is on the tenure track, he or she is evaluated every one, three, five and finally sixth year to determine to what extent they are meeting the

---

[70] Op. Cit. (Gaff & Wilson, 19ul), p. 3.

[71] Joughin, L. (ed.) Academic Freedom and Tenure: A Handbook of the American Association of University Professors (Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1969) pp. 33-39.

goals of the university. After seven years on the track the individual is either finally accepted or rejected. They might also be rejected at any time prior to the seven years expiration date with specified notification. Faculty not on the tenured track can also be removed at any time without reasons being given.[72]

Salary at Penn State is based theoretically on merit, however, there is a great deal of conjecture on this point. The basic decisions on salary are made by the local directors, local academic head and the department head subject to the approval of the Dean of the Commonwealth Campus. (This is for the commonwealth campus.)

The decisions on promotion once again involve faculty (the same faculty committee that decides on tenure), administration (local academic head, local director, and department head - subject to the approval of the Dean, and also includes student input.

The controversy surrounding teaching is not only based on the problems of teaching vs. research. Included here is the fact that most university faculty have not been prepared to teach as a vocation. It has simply been assumed by most academicians that rigorous schooling in a discipline should be sufficient preparation for the in-class professor. Criticism would seem to indicate this particular area of academic preparation should be attended to by means of pedagogical preparation.

In order to increase pedogogical competence it would be necessary to modify the graduate degree program.

---

[72] Faculty Handbook for New Kensington Campus - Penn State University, 1970, pp. 18-23.

Max Wise, for example, has made several interesting suggestions along these lines: develop a program of studies in the graduate school which will help the neophyte discover and develop a style or styles of teaching that are likely to stimulate undergraduate students; help the new teacher realize that he may have to individualize his efforts (strategy for doing this can be developed); making sure that the content of the Ph.D. provides a sufficient basis to prepare the new teacher to select relevant subject matter parallel to his students level of development and to use the existing teaching assistantships and fellowships as a training ground (and screening mechanism) for prospective teachers in higher education.[73]

Commissions, such as the Carnegie Commission have urged that Doctorate of Arts programs be instituted for the specific preparation for teachers. This has particular relevance with the establishment of so many community colleges with a teaching emphasis.

Faculty developmental programs have also been suggested in order to increase teaching effectiveness. These suggestions include educational workshops, reduced teaching loads, special library collections on education, classroom visitations and visiting lecturer programs.[74]

Probably the most successful method to improve teaching is what was mentioned before - reward and encourage it.

---

[73] Wise, Max W., "Who Teaches the Teachers", Improving College Teaching, (ed. by Calvin B.T. Lee), (Washington: American Council on Education, 1967), pp. 77-89.

[74] Centra, John A., "Evaluating College Teaching", The Expanded Campus: Current Issues in Higher Education 1972 (San Francisco: Josey-Bass, Inc. Publishers, 1972), pp. 225-233.

One last issue in this section has to be covered and that is the increasing demand of higher education's constituents (students, administrators, taxpayers and endowment sources) concerning accountability. It would appear that the financial cornucopia of the 1950's and 60's is closing very rapidly.

Various reasons have been given for this phenomena but it all boils down to finances. Higher education is becoming too expensive, $30 billion was spent this year.

Another important reason for this demand is the increasing difficulty of students in obtaining a job when their education is complete.

As colleges and universities have to increasingly depend upon the state legislatures for support a shift in governance seems to be a result.

Faculty, aware of these trends seem to be changing their attitudes toward unionization and collective bargaining. William G. Pettibon makes the following assertions as to why this shift is taking place.

1. The uneven effect of the research boom in the 1950's and 1960's which favored the senior faculty of the more prestigious universities at the expense of the faculty at junior colleges and smaller schools generally.
2. The rapid growth of state education systems which brought into being new and often confusing relations of authority on the campus.
3. The changeover of teachers colleges into liberal arts colleges in state systems which brought new professionally-oriented faculty into conflict with old line administration.

4. Reduction in funds available both for research grants and for administrative purposes.
5. The greater scrutiny of state legislatures and the public generally, which has led to limitations on what had come to be regarded as the traditional prerogatives of faculty.
6. The examples set by union organizations in elementary and high school sectors of education to improve the faculty conditions of employment.
7. The insecurity created by the potential loss of the tenure system.
8. The oversupply of Ph.D.'s with its particular effect on the employment conditions of junior faculty and particularly of women.[75]

There can be little doubt that if this change to collective bargaining does occur it will mean radically different role expectations on the part of all the members in higher education. It is probable that adversarial relations will increase on union campuses. The powers of deans, trustees and senates will slip as governance shifts increasingly to the state legislature. Unions like A.F.T., N.E.A. or A.A.U.P. will vie with the legislature for appropriations. There will probably be a loss of campus leadership because they must engage in the time-consuming

---

[75]Pettibon, W.G., Collective Bargaining-Higher Education, The Pennsylvania State Education Association, 1973, pp. 17-18.

process of bargaining. It also seems likely that the feeling of "academic community" will decline as adversarial relationships increase.[76] Formal evaluational procedure will replace the informal procedure and it will be negotiated out to the last detail. Tenure, promotion and salaries will be conditioned on the over-all rating.

The specific means by which social organizations of higher education recruit faculty are interesting. "One of the most common methods is when faculty, deans or department heads attend annual meetings and use the professional slave markets that exist in each of these gatherings."[77]

A second way is to contact colleges or universities that are turning out individuals in the fields you need to fill.

More recently, with the job market tightening up, prospective candidates are sending out mass mailings of their credentials in hopes of scoring-up a position.

Another form of recruitment is by word-of-mouth. Today, this is probably the best way. The pendulum has swung back to the point of its not "what you know" but "who you know".

The steps in the recruitment process include the establishment of a screening board, review of all vitae by the board, some attempt at a

---

[76] Sisk, R.S. & Duryea, E.D. "Epilogue" Faculty Unions & Collective Bargaining (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Pub., 1973) pp. 195-216.

[77] Op. Cit. (Bronheimer, Burns & Dumke), p. 125.

personal interview (perhaps visit the institution), engage in an in-depth investigation of the remaining candidates after the list is culled and signing the desired individual.[78]

So much for promotion and recruitment within and into the organization. The last section will deal with an evaluation of the system of higher education in relation to its functionality.

Evaluation of the Social System of Higher Education

The type of theoretical orientation that seems to best explain the system of higher education is structural-functionalism.

As Malinowski points out there are certain basic and instrumental needs that must be met if a society is going to remain viable. According to his model, renewal of personnel is an instrumental need and education is the societal response to this need. Thus as culture becomes more complex, specialized, differentiated institutions have to be evolved in order to fill societal needs. Education is such an institution.[79] Higher education is a more specialized system within this large institution. As such, it has been established to meet the specialized needs of society that we might consider as education beyond high school.

Parsons and Shils have attempted to explain the needs of a social system as an entity. Using their theory as a background, higher education as a system must be able to perform four functional imperatives. It must

---

[78] Ibid., pp. 124-126.

[79] Malinowski, Bronislaw, "The Group and the Individual in Functional Analysis", American Journal of Sociology, Vol. XLIV, 5/'39, pp. 938-964.

be able to adapt to the social and non-social environment. The second function is goal attainment. Higher education must be able to secure the desired goal of formally socializing certain selected members of society. The third functional prerequisite is to attempt an integration between the various sub-units of the system in order to assure that they will cooperatively work toward the goal. The last functional prerequisite is to maintain the pattern within the system by which the role-players can secure the goal. Parsons and Shils also refer to this step as tension management.[80]

It is the first function that is of critical importance in an evaluation of the system of higher education, because the emphasis is on how higher education has adapted and adjusted in relation to societal needs.

One way to look at any system of education is that it should mirror the needs, changes and controversies of society and higher education has done just that.

Following will be a chronicle of some of the ways higher education had adapted to societal needs.

Before the American Revolution, the colonists felt they needed religious and political leaders. The colleges, such as Harvard and Yale, reflected these needs in their curriculums. The basic curriculum had not changed much from the Middle Ages - the Trivium and Quadrivium were still in vogue. There was little need for the masses to receive a higher

---

[80]Parsons, Tallcott, Boles, Robt. F. & Shils, Edward A. Working Papers in the Theory of Action, (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1953), Chapter 5.

education as such and Americans, being socialized into a frontier pragmatism, were not about to flock to a social organization that had little practical, everyday, utility.

American higher education does not change appreciably until about 1860 with the introduction of the Industrial Revolution. It is at this juncture that Americans begin to discover and demand a new utility in their educational systems.

The promise of the Enlightenment, that science and its handmaiden, technology would open up a new world for mankind, finally began to come to fruition in the new world.

It was at this juncture, the latter half of the 19th century that higher education came under fire to expand its curriculum to include courses on science, mechanics and technology. The resistance was great, but the pressure to change was greater.

This is also the period of time when high schools were established and their purposes were two in nature: To provide a broad liberal education and a more specialized vocational one. The struggle between these two types of education continues today.

As a selecting mechanism the high school, became a prerequisite to college entrance.

This is also the period of time in which the Morrill Act of 1862 was passed. The express purpose of this act was to provide a broader based access to higher education and a more pragmatic curriculum. That it was successful in making for this adaptation is obvious.

Many of these land-grant colleges have gone on to become universities

that carry on necessary basic research for industry and government. As government involvement in societal life expanded so did its funds for research. One consequence of this integration between government, industry and educational research is the inter-dependence of these three institutions. This, of course, was one of the prime criticisms of the University during the Viet Nam years.

The period immediately following the industrial revolution marks the beginning of American higher education's quest to deliniate academic freedom.

This battle began with the ideas of Darwin (evolution) vs. religious ideology and has incorporated such struggles as Freudian psychology, Communism, the Viet Nam War and today, sex education.

The crux of the struggle revolves around the right to teach about controversial issues but the responsibility not to use the classroom to proselytize the instructor's particular ideology. The point is that it is not a license to preach but a right to explicate and analyze controversial issues.[81]

The impact of the needs engendered by the industrial revolution were not fully felt until after World War II when the ranks of college-goers were swelled by men and women taking advantage of the G.I. Bill. Enrollments soared during the 50's and 60's and a college education became similar to a high school education in the 1870's. The prospects for today with eight million students enrolled in institution of higher education and increasing cybernation of industry, would seem to be under-employment.

---

[81] Op. Cit. (Faculty Tenure), p. 256.

Thus, people with degrees will probably have to take less challenging types of jobs than they have been trained for. And as long as we Americans define the meaning to our lives in terms of work (the Protestant Ethic), it will probably mean more worker alienation.

Another basic change that began in the latter part of the 19th century was the development of community colleges.

The reason for the development of these community colleges were: The almost universal desire of Americans to have an institution of advanced learning in their immediate area: criticisms of students coming to the universities (lack of preparation); criticisms of large universities for losing their flexibility in curriculum change and being elitist in their selection and the American ideal of open access to all persons.

Community colleges were a response to the immediate needs of our society - more technically (vocationally) trained people; adult educational needs and community services. As such, they generally reflect the population makeup of the community more effectively than the university or four year college.

The community college system seems to be aware of the future in our society. Such prestigious organizations as the Carnegie Commission has praised and encouraged their efforts.

Another era that seems to have been particularly productive in terms of demands on higher education to change was the post World War II era and the Viet Nam era.

It was during this time that current minority and female demands for changes became crystallized. As a result of these demands curriculums have been changed. New courses like female consciousness and etc. have

been added to the curriculum and in some cases totally new disciplines have been introduced (Black Studies).

Minorities and females have also been successful in the areas of putting pressure on to recruit students and faculty members (Affirmative Action programs).

All of these have had the effect of demanding that higher education adapt and adjust its forms of social organization (public universities, private universities, public and private colleges, community colleges and etc.), its curriculum (Black Studies, ethnic courses, female courses and etc.) and its very structure. Students demanded and won seats on the Board of Trustees and seats in the Faculty Senate during the 1960's.

Other changes have included increased government support, pressure for accountability, shift in governance and the movement towards collective bargaining in the part of the faculty (these trends have been analyzed in previous sections and to do so again would be redundant.

With the above flexibility in mind (strive for equilibrium), it seems likely that higher education will be able to help our society adjust to its changing needs in the future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bayer, Alan E. "College Faculties: 'Le Plus Ca Change'", Change, Vol. 6, No. 4, March 1974.

Bayer, Alan E., College & University Faculty: A Statistical Description (Washington: American Council on Education, 1970).

Bornheimer, Deane G.; Burns, Gerald & Dumke, Glenn S., The Faculty in Higher Education (Illinois: The Interstate Printers & Publishers, Inc.) 1973.

Brown, D. "Personality, College Environments and Productivity" in The American College (ed. N. Sandford), (New York: Wiley, 1962).

Brown, Hugh S. and Mayhew, Lewis B., American Higher Education (New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc.), 1965.

Brown, James W. & Thornton, James W., Jr., College Teaching - A Systematic Approach (New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1963).

Cartter, Alan M., "Future Faculty: Needs & Resources", In Improving College Teaching, Calvin B. T. Lee (ed.), (Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education) 1967.

Centra, John A., "Evaluating College Teaching", The Expanded Campus: Current Issues in Higher Education 1972 (San Francisco: Josey-Bass, Inc. Publishers, 1972).

Deighton, Lee C. (ed.), The Encyclopedia of Education, Vol. 4, (The Macmillan Company & Free Press), 1971.

Dunaway, W. F., History of the Pa. State College (Lancaster Press, Inc., Lancaster, Pa.).

Elliot, Charles William, Address at Inauguration at Harvard's President (Cambridge, 1869).

Evans, Jerome "Free Access: What It Takes", Change, Vol. 6, No. 2, March 1974.

Faculty Handbook for New Kensington Campus - Penn State University, 1970.

Gaff, J. G. & Wilson, R. C., "The Relationship Between Professor's Views of the Formal Incentive System and their Career Status"., (Paper presented at the meeting of Western Psychological Assoc., Vancouver, British Columbia, June 10, 1969).

Hammond, P. C.; Meyer, J. W. and Miller, D., "Teaching Versus Research: Sources of Misperceptions", Journal of Higher Education, XL (Dec. 1969).

Joughlin, L. (ed.), Academic Freedom and Tenure: A Handbook of the American Association of University Professors (Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1969).

Keast, William R. & Macy, John W., Jr., Faculty Tenure. "Academic Tenure in America: A Historical Essay", Walter P. Metzger. (Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973).

Keats, John, The Sheepskin Psychosis, (New York: Dell Publishing Co., Inc. 1963).

Kerr, Clark T. (et. al.) Carnegie Commission Report on the Open Door Colleges: Policies for Community Colleges, (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishing Co., 1974).

Kidd, Chas. V., "Graduate Education: The New Debate", Change, Vol. 6, No. 4, May 1974.

Lenski, Gerhard., Human Societies, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1970).

Malinowski, Bronislaw, "The Group and the Individual in Functional Analysis", American Journal of Sociology, Vol. XLIV, 5/'39.

Marguiles, R. Z. & Blau, P. M., "The Pecking Order of the Elite: America's Leading Professional Schools", Change, Vol. 5, No. 9, Nov. 1973.

Martin, W. B., Conformity: Standards & Change in Higher Education (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969).

Morrison, Samuel Elliot, The Founding of Harvard College Cambridge, 1935).

Morrison, Samuel Elliot, Three Centuries of Harvard (Cambridge, 1936.

Office of Civil Rights of the Dept. of Health, "Undergraduate Enrollment of Minorities in U. S. Higher Education", The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. IX, Number 8, Nov. 11, 1974.

Parsons, Tallcott; Boles, Robt. F. & Shils, Edward A., Working Papers in the Theory of Action, (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1953).

Pettibon, W. G., Collective Bargaining - Higher Education, The Pennsylvania State Education Assoc., 1973).

Report of Enrollment, Student Credit Hours, Course Credits and Faculty Activity Academic Year 1972-73. Office of the President, The Pa. State University, March 30, 1973.

Rudolph, Frederick, The American College & University: A History, (New York: Vintage Books) 1962.

Seckinger, Prof. Robert, Notes from History of Higher Education (221), Feb. 13, 1974.

Sisk, R. S. & Duryea, E. D., "Epilogue" Faculty Unions & Collective Bargaining (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Pub., 1973).

The Office of Civil Rights of the Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare "1972 Enrollment of Minorities in U. S. Graduate Schools", The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. IX, Number 11, Dec. 2, 1974.

The Pa. State Source Book, Appendix A., "An Act to Incorporate The Farmers' High School of Pennsylvania" (The Pa. State Univ., University Park, Pa.), July 1, 1973.

The Penn State Source Book, The Pa. State University, July 1, 1974.

Thielins, W., Jr., "The Undergraduate's View Of Professors Research: Findings from the Empirical Literature" (Unpublished paper, Bureau of Applied Research, Columbia University, Jan., 1971).

Thwing, Charles F., American Colleges: Their Students & Work (New York, 1878); U. S. Office of Education: Educational Directory 1960-61, Part 3, Higher Education (Washington 1960).

U. S. Dept. of Health, Education & Welfare, "A Century of Growth of U. S. Colleges", The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. VIII, No. 40, Aug. 19, 1974.

Wayland, Francis, Thoughts on the Present Collegiate System in the United States (Boston, 1842).

Wilson, R. C. & Gaff, J. G., The Teaching Environment (Berkeley: The Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of Calif., 1971).

Wise, Max W., "Who Teaches the Teachers", Improving College Teaching, (ed. by Calvin B. T. Lee), (Washington: American Council on Education, 1967).

Yankelovich, Daniel & Clark, Ruth, "College & Non-college Youth Values", Change, Vol. 6, Number 7, Sept. 1974.